



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Criticism of this work is likely to be directed to three main points: (1) to the inclusion of variants from several editions, (2) to the classification within the articles, and (3) to the use of a large number of subdivisions. Most lexicographers either establish a text of their own or follow some good text. So, for instance, Leo's text has been made the basis for the Plautine citations which are appearing in the *Thesaurus*. Space, as well as the reader's time in examining a citation, is saved by these means. But the text of Plautus is not so surely established as is that of many other ancient authors, and it is very helpful to learn from a lexicon that at a given point there is difficulty and to get all the light upon it which may be had from the MS readings and from the conjectures of the best Plautine critics. The bearing of the second and third points of criticism may be illustrated by a brief examination of the article on *contra*. This word is treated under two heads, viz., as an adverb, and as a preposition with the accusative, dative, and ablative. All the instances cited with the dative and ablative, e. g., *aurichalco contra non carum fuit meum mendacium*, Ps. 688, the reviewer would regard as adverbial. Lodge gives three cases with the accusative as sure and four more as possible. In all his possible instances the accusative should probably be taken as the object of the verb of the sentence; the text is doubtful in all three of his sure cases, while over against these three stand fifty-four clear instances of the use of *contra* as an adverb. In other words, it is very doubtful if *contra* should ever be taken as a preposition in Plautus. In the same article heading No. 4, "*leniore sensu*," is rather vague; Nos. 6 and 7 are not classified on the same basis as the other numbers, and it is not clear why *Per.* 208 under No. 6 does not stand under No. 1. This brief analysis of a rather extreme case may illustrate the different opinions which may be held by scholars with reference to the classification of meanings in some of the articles, but in general the classification has been made with great judgment and the results presented with admirable clearness. The completed work will contain sixteen fascicles so that approximately one-third of it is already in print. The citations for the entire lexicon are already prepared and the MS for the sixth fascicle, which completes the letter F, is ready for the printer, so that the completion of the work within a reasonable time is assured. It will stand as a worthy monument to the scholarship of the editor.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Singular und Plural. By KURT WITTE. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. viii + 270. M. 8.

Witte begins with the proposition, well supported, that each word had originally its own number, e. g., *πηγαί, ῥοαί, θύραι, λαοί, ζειαί, κριθαί, πύλαι, ῥῖνες, φρένες, τρίχες, ἔθειραι, σάρκες, ὄχρα* were plural only; while *εὐνή, κλισίη,*

πνοιή, ἀκτῆ, χαίτη, κόμη, μῦθος, ψάμαθος, μέγαρον, δάκρυ, στέρνον, τόξον, νῶτον, μέτωπον, ἄρμα, πῆμα, στήθος, χάρις, ὕδωρ were singular, except when used with plural meaning as true plurals.

I shall illustrate his method by showing how he explains the shift of *στήθος* to plural and of *φρένες* to singular without change of meaning. The plural of *στήθος* is practically confined to the dative, where the verse might demand *στήθεσσι(ν)*, *στήθεσι(ν)*, but could not have developed the metrically difficult singular *στήθει*. We have a true plural in Δ 289:

τοῖος πᾶσιν θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γένοιτο .

The meter under the influence of *φρεσί*, originally plural, developed the poetic plural. (The phrase poetic plural conveys a false idea, but is used for convenience.) Compare these two verses:

Φ 583: ἦ δὴ πον μάλ' ἔολπας ἐνὶ φρεσί, φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
φ 317: οὐδ' αὐτὸς πον τοῦτό γ' ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ἔολπεν,

Hence the reason for the familiar rule "When *στήθος* means a part of the body, as such, the singular is generally used, the plural when it means the mind," since when it means mind *στήθεσσι* is a substitute for and is dominated by *φρεσί*. The last step in the change is taken, when this dative plural frees itself from its analogue, the reason for its use in the plural is forgotten, and the poetic plural is used for a part of the body as such:

K 131: ὥς εἰπὼν ἔνδυνε περὶ στήθεσσι χιτῶνα.

Meter and analogy with a word of like meaning, *θυμός*, developed the singular of *φρένες* in the phrase *κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν*. Homer confines the singular to the accusative except in two late passages where the origin of the accusative singular was forgotten and *φρένα* became independently productive, so that a nominative and dative singular were created, K 45, Z 65.

ἄρμα, originally singular, became plural, not because a chariot was composed of parts, but from the meter, from analogy with *ἄχαια*, a plural, and also from association with the plural *ἵπποι*; as in

E 192: ἵπποι δ' οὐ παρέασι καὶ ἄρματα τῶν κ' ἐπιβαίην .

Thus these nouns appear in three stages, the original number, a change under the influence of meter and analogy, and finally when the original number and the reason for the change were ignored or forgotten. Witte uses the stages of variation to determine the relative antiquity of the books of Homer, the oldest books showing the least, the latest books the most, deviation from the original singular or plural. The

oldest books of the *Iliad* are Π-P, the latest is Ω; *Odyssey*, αχ the latest. The bulk of the *Odyssey* lies between the earliest and latest books of the *Iliad*. Witte sees the original of Σ 24 in Π 798. Robert using another theory assigned Σ 24 to the *Uriliad*, Π 798 to a later addition. Quot homines tot sententiae!

Applying these methods to Hesiod Witte finds the bulk of *Theogony* and *Works and Days* is older than the later Homeric books, but late verses have been interpolated, e. g., W. and D. 753 contains the form λουτρῶ. There is no other example of the singular of this noun until *Antigone* 1201, where because of the meter Sophocles substituted the accusative singular. In the passage in Hesiod there was no metrical reason for the change, hence the singular dates from Sophocles, and this verse is dependent on and subsequent to the *Antigone*. Aristophanes parodies this innovation of tragedy in *Wasps* 604; πρωκτὸς λουτροῦ περιγιγνόμενος, κτλ.

ὕδατα as poetic plural was developed by the choral lyric, and was first used in the dative plural without necessity of meter in Euripides *Alceste* 159. This then dates the free use of this word as plural with singular meaning. The *Batrachomyomachia* abounds in this use, hence must be later than the *Alceste*. Epic verse is so conservative that the poem must be much younger than the passages imitated.

The dramatic poets, as the epic, continued to change the original or received number under the stress of meter or analogy. Aristophanes generally avoided the innovation of tragic poetry, choosing rather the popular speech, except in parody.

Apollonius was more conservative in developing forms or accepting those already developed than most of the books of Homer (accordingly older), and so on this basis would wreck the theory, hence it is clear that Apollonius made just such a study as Witte himself, and thus avoided the errors of the late Homeric books; "Wer wusste vorher etwas von dem zeitlichen Verhältnis der Numeri φρένες φρήν? Von den Modernen niemand. Anders die Alexandriner; sie waren genau unterrichtet über die Erscheinung, die wir oberflächlich bisher den poetischen Plural genannt haben." However, although Apollonius had anticipated Witte in the knowledge of the use of φρένες, the facts about ὕδαρ had escaped him, so he uses the dative plural twelve times, Homer never. The author clearly presses his theories too far.

The division of Homer into strata in accordance with the divergence from the original number of nouns is a clever and interesting piece of linguistic dexterity, but will convince no one inclined to doubt. However, as a study of language and the development in syntax the book is of unusual merit.

JOHN A. SCOTT